

Standardising Differences?

Andrea Allard, Deakin University, Australia

Introduction

For reformists of the left and right, and for those concerned with issues of social justice and equity, education has long been a site of contestation. In Australia, multiple and often contradictory discourses operate concerning how teachers should teach children from Language Backgrounds Other than English (LBOTE), those who are economically disadvantaged and those whose religious or cultural background is different to mainstream populations. Caught in the vortex of these diverse approaches, new graduate teachers, working in schools with increasingly diverse cohorts of students not only struggle to make sense of their students' curriculum and pedagogical needs but also how best to establish and maintain productive relationships across differences (Department of Education, Science & Training 2002).

Ensuring that new teaching graduates are skilled and competent to teach cross-culturally and inclusively is seen as significant for a range of different reasons: eg., many of those students who are over-represented in the 'at risk' or early school leaving cohort are also those from LBOTE, of non-Anglo cultural heritage and, most significantly, are economically disadvantaged (PISA, 2003, Teese and Polesol 2003). Leaving school early (ie. before completing Year 12 qualifications) makes these young people vulnerable to ongoing social disadvantage (Bessant et al. 2003).

Ensuring young people, particularly those least advantaged, remain at school has become a political and economic goal of the OECD countries—important not only for the benefits to the individual but for the well-being of nations as well. In the United Kingdom, for example, under the influence of Giddens (1998) and the New Labour's commitment to The Third Way, emphasis is placed on 'social inclusion' with a whole-of-government approach adapted to addressing the ongoing educational, social and psychological needs of young people deemed to be 'at risk' due to class, cultural or 'race' vulnerabilities. In Australia, developing alternative educational

'pathways' to keep young people engaged in education is part of the current reform agenda nationally and at the state level.

Additionally, the need to prepare tomorrow's adults to take their place in a world that will be vastly different from that which we know today requires educationalists to take seriously the impetus to recognise and work with different ways of knowing and of being—ways that stand in contrast to the twentieth century colonialist/euro-centric understandings of knowledge and of pedagogies (Elliot 1999, Ball 2000).

Ball (2000, 491) argues, for example, that

Social, economic and political situations have changed drastically...and the enormous complexities of today's world require a new vision for schooling that responds to the needs of the global society in which we live. That vision must articulate a mission for the delivery of instruction that is intellectually challenging while meeting the diverse needs of students who bring varying experiences, resources and beliefs to the classroom.

Whether argued on the basis of social justice for 'the least advantaged' (Connell 1993, 23) or on the basis of increasing human capital to ensure a more economically sound and cohesive society, (Business Council of Australia 2003), the importance of keeping students engaged in education—and especially those students who are most in need of support due to economic or cultural disadvantage—is deemed to be of critical importance. A highly skilled and competent teaching profession is seen as 'the front line' for these economic and social imperatives. Standards currently being established as part of the teacher accreditation process in Victoria and Queensland, as well as in other states in Australia, include for example, the requirement that teachers will be able to meet 'the Government's and the community's goals for inclusion of culturally and linguistically diverse students'. (Education and Training Committee of the Parliament of Victoria 2005, 136).

How can teacher education programs enable new teachers to develop and demonstrate such competency?

In this paper, I broadly review a number of discourses around identity and difference that play out within teacher education programs, particularly in Australia, but with reference to research in North America, and the UK as well. I do so in order to map common discourses that operate within education around difference and diversity, and to consider how future teachers make sense of these. Exploring these discourses opens up for discussion ways to assist new graduates to develop the understandings and skills required to demonstrate 'socially just professional practice' (Board of Teacher Registration, Queensland 2002, 7).

However, before doing so, I want to briefly highlight how I am using particular concepts borrowed from feminist poststructuralist theories, including notions of 'discourse', subjectivities, 'investments' in particular discourses and 'positions' in discourses of gender, ethnicity, 'race' and class. Elsewhere I have discussed more fully how I understand and use these ideas (Allard 2002, Allard 2004); here I gesture to those understandings in order to provide a way of framing the picture I want to paint concerning common discourses around 'difference' that operate as ways of making sense of the world.

Discourse

Central to feminist post-structural theorising is the idea of multiple discourses, the ways in which meanings are made from culturally and historically constructed 'truths'. Post-structural theorising denies the notion that there are ideas and beliefs that are shared by human beings across all cultures and throughout history. Rather than arguing for universal 'truths', or meta-narratives, the concept of 'discourse' is utilised. Discourses are seen as ways of making meaning that are localised, politicised and given status of 'truth' only through an act of subordinating other competing and potentially valid ways of viewing the world.

Biklen, in her study of primary teachers and the construction of gender in education (1995, 81) explains 'discourses' as:

...institutionalized ways of understanding relationships, activities, and meanings that emerge through language (talk, rules, thoughts, writing) and influence what people in specific institutions take to be true. Discourses shape how people understand the world and therefore how they act in it. In fact, they are aimed at producing certain effects...

Thus, the discourses that operate in and through teacher education programs as well as mainstream cultural practices that endorse or challenge ideas of 'difference' provide a variety of ways for student-teachers to make sense of gender, ethnicity, 'race' and class differences. There are various discourses 'available' to them. As part of the process of interpreting these discourses and locating themselves in those that resonate with their own values, beliefs and practices, student teachers' personal and professional identities are subjectively constructed.

Subjectivities

The work of feminist poststructuralists (eg. Hollway 1984, Weedon 1987; Davies 1994, 1997, Middleton 1995, 1998, Jones 1997) has been instrumental in theorising understandings about 'subjectivities', for example, thinking about gender, ethnicity, class, 'race' as intersecting identity categories that might be understood as 'always in the act of becoming'. The feminist post-structural concept of subjectivity thus argues against an emphasis on rational, coherent, unified individuals—the domain of liberal humanism. Instead, 'subjectivity' encapsulates the idea that individuals in different contexts

and at different times may take up contradictory positions, act upon competing beliefs and values. Such contradictory positions are not necessarily or always chosen *consciously*. Rather, because particular meanings may resonate or appeal to the individual at different times and in different contexts, positionality within different discourses may be enacted through unconscious appeals to the emotions. Particular discourses may offer subject positions in which specific pleasures or desires are answered.

Investments

Hollway's work around the notion of 'investment' is useful in thinking about why some discourses appear to be taken up more easily and/or why teacher education students position themselves in particular ways. Hollway (1984, 238) argues that:

By claiming that people have investments... in taking up certain positions in discourses, and consequently in relation to each other, I mean that there will be some satisfaction or pay-off or reward... for that person. The satisfaction may well be in contradiction with other resultant feelings. It is not necessarily conscious or rational. But there is a reason.

Clearly, for many of our pre-service teachers, there are some ways of making sense of difference around ethnicity, 'race' gender and class that, as members of the dominant culture, they prefer or feel more comfortable with. In this sense they 'invest' in these discourses, and by doing so, position themselves in relations to students in particular ways.

In the next section, I present a speculative, broad brush account of a number of discourses and consider how/why taking up positions in these may not always be productive or beneficial in terms of teaching cross-culturally. Finally, I raise questions regarding what constitutes productive ways to teach inclusive and transformative pedagogies in light of current theory and practice.

'We are all the same under the skin'

The stated belief that 'we are all the same under the skin' is grounded in the ideals of the Western Enlightenment and is premised on notions of 'universal truths' that apply to every human being *regardless* of gender, ethnicity, social class and 'race'. Within education, this discourse positions teachers as able and obligated to attend to and act on these 'universally shared' human qualities/characteristics. With the foci on *sameness*, that which may mark some students as different to the mainstream, eg., those students from Language Backgrounds Other Than English (LBOTE), or who live in poverty, or whose sexual preferences are not heterosexual—any or all of these are viewed as unimportant and in some ways such differences may be ignored. In this discourse, teachers build relationships with students on the premise that *despite* differences, every student is equally worthy of fair treatment.

This reiteration of the belief in 'sameness' within educational theories is encapsulated in the work of many developmental psychologies that argue that all children will develop along a particular continuum of age-related stages—and those who fail to do so are in need of remediation or are classified as unable to thrive (eg. Piaget 1971, Erikson 1993). This is a powerful and persuasive discourse and often operates in teacher education as a taken-for-granted truth.

As a governing discourse, beliefs and practices derived from liberal humanism serve an important purpose in formulating the argument that all human beings have the same rights. With regard to education, these rights are most notably

enshrined in the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child (1959). Education that is 'free, compulsory and secular' is a right of every child in Australia. As a principle of operation within education, this discourse positions teachers as powerful arbiters of just and fair treatment; providing the *same* curriculum for and expecting the *same* standards of all children are measures of this. But 'fairness' in this discourse does not operate as a means to account for material differences or inequitable/discriminatory practices in terms of resource distribution or in terms of devaluing beliefs that do not accord with the mainstream. 'Fairness' as it equates with 'sameness' negates material and/or embodied differences.

This discourse is useful but not sufficient in itself to enable teachers to work effectively with those who *because of* gender, cultural values, beliefs, 'race', class may have a very different knowledge/meaning making system than those who represent the 'mainstream'. Thus seeing children as 'all the same' in fact denies the possibility that there are equally valid but very different knowledge and value systems that stand in contrast to those held by the hegemonic cultural group. Even minority groups within Western democratic societies can be disadvantaged through this adherence to 'sameness' if their cultural practices do not coincide with those of the dominant majority—as is the case for some Aboriginal communities in Australia.

Thus, the belief that 'we are all the same under the skin' operates to ignore differential power relations; it privileges Anglo-Australian beliefs/values; makes central and 'normal' the experiences of the majority and marginalises or silences the voices from other cultures, or those who are materially less well off.

Ongoing research over many decades in Australia, in the United States and in the UK has demonstrated that particular groups—groups who are economically disadvantaged (Connell 1993, Teese et al. 2000, Teese and Polesol 2003, Hooks 2000), or who are 'racially' or culturally different from the mainstream (Rizvi 1993, Delpit 1995, Ladson-Billings 2001) are those who frequently do not experience educational success in keeping with their numbers. Additionally, in Australia, females who are economically disadvantaged and/or who are from particular ethnic groups are less likely than their male peers to attain educational qualifications (Collins et al. 2000, Lamb and McKenzie 2000). Assessing educational outcomes in terms of retention, achievement and qualifications serves to demonstrate that with regards to economic status, cultural heritage, gender and 'race', children/students are *NOT* all the same.

With this emphasis on 'sameness', pre-service teachers, (most of whom have had an Anglo-Australian, middle class educational experience themselves), find it difficult to understand why particular groups are over-represented in statistics that measure educational failure. Because the system has produced *them* as successful achievers, they find it hard to see why others might fail. Often the response when they are asked to move away/critique the 'sameness' discourse is to argue from their beliefs—again derived from liberal humanist principles—that such failure is due to *individual* lack—ie., individuals fail because their poor or migrant families don't value education or because these individual students don't work hard enough or because they simply lack the 'ability' to do well. Locating failure within the *individual* rather than questioning the appropriateness of curriculum and pedagogies for particular *groups*, whose knowledge and values go unrecognised, leads to a circular—and non-productive way of making sense of difference. It closes down the possibilities of engaging with these categories of difference in ways that will enhance rather than limit educational outcomes.

The exotic other

A somewhat contrasting but nevertheless related approach to the focus on 'sameness' as a means to deny difference is that of 'othering'. In this explanation, those who differ from the mainstream in cultural heritage, economic status and sometimes 'race', may be viewed by student-teachers as wonderfully exotic, unknown and mysterious 'others', in contrast to those whose heritage, language and economic status is (boringly) mainstream and familiar. Here, not knowing enough about 'the other' and therefore, not being sufficiently aware of and able to work with difference is viewed as a problem by many (e.g. in Australia: Allard and Santoro 2005, Aveling 2002, Malin 1991, Rizvi 2003. In North America: Cochran-Smith 1995, Cockrell et al. 1999, Echols and Stader 2002, Olmedo 1997). One argument frequently made is that because so many teachers and teacher educators are 'white' and middle-class, they are likely to have had little or no experience working with people of different cultural heritage. According to Cockrell, et al. (1999, 355), many pre-service teachers "operate from a limited base of knowledge about culture and identity". Such limited educational experiences and knowledge may result in (new) teachers being unable to engage with and establish positive relationships with those students most in need of recognition and support. This concern is succinctly highlighted by African-American educator, Lisa Delpit (1995, 183) who cites the words of a Native Alaskan educator, when she says, "in order to teach you, I must know you".

Locating oneself in the discourse where difference is acknowledged and addressed ala culture, class, 'race' as these intersect with gender, means that familiarity need not 'breed contempt' but rather awe and wonder at the diversity and cleverness of others. Learning about differences in order to engage students from the knowledge basis that they already bring to classrooms is a way forward—but requires time, effort, humility and a chance to critically reflect cross-culturally. Such a discourse offers both hopeful and difficult positions.

However, this desire to appreciate and utilise 'difference' in and through curriculum and pedagogies, even with the best of intentions, can at times result in essentialising or simplifying 'difference' into manageable categories that can reinforce the 'exotic' dimensions rather than challenge clichés and stereotypes. Too often when notions of 'the other' are simplified into 'celebrating difference' this can slide into curriculum or pedagogies that are superficial and 'tokenistic' what is sometimes referred to, in Australia, as the 'stomp and chomp' approach to diversity, i.e. differences become symbolised through 'exotic' foods, music, dances and clothing as examples and these are marked out for occasional appreciation through 'multicultural week' or 'Greek dancing days'. Such one-off events may be a useful introduction to the many ways differences can be played out but are insufficient in themselves to bring about long term and systemic revisions of curricula and pedagogical practices so that diverse knowledge systems and values are explored and trans-cultural understanding is developed.

The threatening 'other'

An additional dimension to the process of exoticising 'the other' is the emphasis on the importance of tolerance and respect for *everyone's* values and beliefs. Tolerance is a corner stone of this theoretical position and one that resonates well with notions of democratic and civic societies. However, such 'civilised' values built around tolerance and respect may disappear when 'difference' becomes too marked; then 'the other' is no longer viewed as exotic or worthy of respect but rather as a threat. When under pressure, tolerance for

difference may extend only so far—ie, only to those who are not *that* different from the dominant value system. A current—and shameful example—of how quickly ‘the other’ can become ‘the threat’ occurred recently in Australia when some sections of the media and the government produced diatribes over ‘terrorists in our midst’—and found an easy target. In August, 2005, two female politicians called for the banning of the hijab in all government schools, arguing that when Muslim young women wear head scarves to school, this is representative of ‘a clash of cultures’. The headscarf, they argued was being used as ‘an iconic act of defiance’. Bronwyn Bishop, a Liberal Member of Parliament, made the link in this way:

[The headscarf] has become an icon, the symbol of the clash of cultures, and it runs much deeper than a piece of cloth. The fact of the matter is we’ve got people in our country who are advocating—and I’m talking about extremist Islamist leaders—the overturning of our laws which guarantee freedom. (The Age, 29/08/05, 2)

It is worth noting that Bishop felt obliged to explain just who was ‘advocating... the overturning of laws that guarantee freedom’—perhaps because, on the basis of her own pronouncements, she could be mistaken for one of those. To the credit of many other politicians and citizens, the notion of banning headscarves was roundly condemned. However, that Bishop and her colleague felt safe enough to put the idea forward and that this took up so much space in mainstream media, is indicative of how arbitrary the practices of ‘tolerance’ may be. Just as the discourse of liberal humanism focuses on ‘sameness’ as a means to ignore differential positions of power, in this discourse of ‘the other’ as threat, particular indicators of ‘difference’ may be condemned and sanctioned—but only by those in the mainstream power positions. Worth asking: if the two politicians spent more time with and/or had friends who were Muslim women, would they better understand the reasons for wearing the hijab? Would this make them more—or less—tolerant? In short, does ‘knowing’ more about ‘the other’ necessarily ensure fair treatment—or in the case of education—meaningful teaching and learning? Is tolerance as a position ever ‘enough’?

In these discourses, ‘difference’ from the mainstream or dominant culture may be understood as either ‘exotic’ and thus a cause for (tokenistic) celebrations or as ‘otherness’ that must be either tolerated or, if viewed as too different, condemned as threatening. Backlash against gays and lesbians by ultra conservative religions, harassment of women who achieve positions of power in male dominated corporations, demonising particular ethnic communities that maintain their languages and customs over several generations, the vilification of Muslims by mainly Christian countries—all of these can be viewed as examples of how arbitrary are the levels of tolerance to gatekeepers in mainstream Western societies. The ways that notions of tolerance may fluctuate is of growing concern to those who are minorities, even in countries such as Australia that habitually brag about being examples of the multicultural success story.

How might such discourses be deconstructed and worked with so that prospective teachers move beyond seeing their students as the ‘exotic other’ or as in need of assimilation in order to make them ‘more like us’ (Allard and Santoro 2005)?

Difference as ‘choice’

Additionally, tolerance of difference, acceptance of that which is not familiar, in itself, is an insufficient discursive position for educators as well. Mere *tolerance* does not address another,

darker side of ‘othering’. In this alternate discourse, differences are explained as a matter of *choice* and therefore, not something to be concerned about at all. Here, as the argument goes, those students who do not ‘belong’ to the mainstream often choose to stick with ‘their own kind’ (in the words of the musical, *Westside Story*). Since this is *their choice*, therefore it must be tolerated and accepted. However, Rizvi suggests that such an explanation can work to re-badge racism in a more subtle form. Rizvi (1993, 135) argues:

As children grow older, they develop ways of expressing forms of racism that, while they are not overtly offensive, nevertheless represent a discourse that has been identified as ‘new’ racism. The talk of “us” and “them” is a central part of this discourse, the practical manifestation of which lies in the patterns of friendship formed around ethnic differentiation.

In some ways, this refusal to engage with ‘the other’ is based on the age-old argument of ‘separate but equal’, a quietly unacknowledged form of segregation, that in the long term, can be more devastating because it denies the commonality and the potential to learn from each other that would be the mark of real respect rather than mere tolerance. To the extent that teacher education programs do not utilise curriculum and pedagogies that challenge and displace such forms of ‘othering’, we offer little scope for our students to develop the requisite skills to engage productively with ‘difference’. This is not to insist on some mythical metanarrative of the ‘brotherhood of man’ wherein everyone must be friends; rather, it is to argue that ‘choice’ is never really choice if it is built around ignorance, exclusion and isolation. Choices only occur when the entire—or at least a representative sample—of the field is known and available and there is the possibility of choosing without punitive ramifications.

Related to this notion of ‘choice’ and the ‘freely choosing individual’ (Rose 1996), some interesting work in the field of cultural studies and with ‘Generation Y’ suggests that consumer/style icons may play a greater part in how young people construct their public personae—that is, they may have far greater ‘investments’ in identity formations based on the images that are represented by consumables than in choosing to see themselves through the more traditional sociological lenses of gender, ‘race’, class etc.

For example, some British research (e.g. Phoenix and Tizard 1996, Wulff 1995) suggests that constructions of social identities in young people are done on the basis of choice of clothes, musical tastes and other material possessions. The more traditional sociological definitions concerning ‘social class’ or ‘ethnicity’ appear to be open for re-negotiation around consumer culture and status symbols promoted through the internationalisation of products and what they come to represent for specific peer groups. Writing of her ethnographic study with ‘an ethnically mixed group of (twenty) young teenage girls... in South London’, Wulff (1995, 64) argues that:

... the girls put together their youth styles through consumption of clothes, shoes, cosmetics and music – all significant ingredients in their teen age femininity... A micro perspective such as this shows how these girls consumed youth styles in much the way they liked and that again fitted with their ideas of ethnic equality...

Elsewhere (Allard 2002) I have discussed how young second generation Italian-Australian and Greek-Australian males ‘redo’ their identities by buying into the iconic image of the blonde, ‘Aussie’ beach bum, presenting with hair that is dyed, wearing sunglasses and jewelry that epitomise the stereotype of what Tsolidis (2001, 7) calls ‘an imagined embodiment’.

Interestingly, Tsolidis goes on to argue that such a re-

presentation of self has less to do with the freedom of *choosing* one's identity and more to do with 'being part of an ethnic minority [that] makes one vulnerable at least, to accusations of non-belonging. This vulnerability is somehow linked to understandings of Australianness which have British cultural underpinnings and an imagined embodiment—the bronzed, blonde and blue-eyed'.

Hence, perhaps, the reconstruction of self to 'fit' into the cultural majority. Such 'choice' then is not, as Rose (1996) argues, indicative of the icon of late modernity, the 'freely choosing individual', but rather done in light of the governing discourses that operate within particular milieus to situate some students as belonging and others as 'different' or as less powerful 'other'. Additionally, in the ongoing debate around 'distributive justice' versus the 'politics of recognition' (Young 1990, Fraser, 1996, 1998) the importance of recognizing the materiality/lived realities of particular kinds of disadvantage is highlighted. Poverty ensures that some students have far fewer choices of how they may re-present themselves or choose to construct their identities; in contrast, those students from the middle or privileged classes have many more 'choices' available. Put simply, people living in poverty do not have the luxury of investing in consumer objects that will 'redefine' their sense of self. Thus, the argument about the 'fluidity' of the freely choosing individual identity is limited by the reality of poverty. Nevertheless, this argument concerning student (and teacher?) identities as 'fluid' and 'chosen' is another discourse that teachers need to understand and be able to work within.

Conclusion

From the above brief review of some key discourses that operate around 'difference' and the ways that teacher-educators, student-teachers and students themselves take up positions within such discourses, I have aimed to highlight some questions regarding what constitutes productive ways to teach inclusive and transformative pedagogies. By suggesting the complexities of each and all of these discourses, I want to argue that working with 'difference' cannot be understood in terms of 'either/or' approaches. Rather, we need to engage our teacher education students in developing the skills of critical reflection so that they are able to move among and select from the range of these discourses those positions that will best enhance the educational experiences of their students.

In short, our prospective teachers need a critical perspective in order to select what will work on any given day, within a particular context to in order to establish relationships with *all* their students; they need to be able to reflect on, plan and implement culturally relevant curriculum and pedagogies. If teachers are to be reflective in their practices when working with diverse groups of students, they need to know the gamut of discursive positions available to them around 'difference' and diversity issues. That relationships would be differently constructed, that curriculum, pedagogies and assessments would be differently developed depending on whether students are viewed as all the same; as the exotic—or threatening—'other'; as identities 'in the act of becoming'; or as freely choosing image consumers of different identities is a necessary field of knowledge that will enable teachers to make professional decisions as to which approach will best serve their diverse students on any given day. Until and unless teacher education programs find ways to enable pre-service teachers to work through and with the meaning of each of these (and more...), than we have not helped them to become trans-cultural, cross-class and gender inclusive professionals. Much remains to be done to achieve this goal.

References

- 'Bishop backs headscarf ban' in: *The Age*, 29/08/2005, 2 (<http://theage.com.au/articles/2005/08/29>, accessed Sept 1, 2005).
- Allard, A. (2002), 'Aussies' and "Wogs" and the 'Group in-between': Year 10 students' constructions of cross-cultural friendships' in: *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, vol 23, no. 2, 193-209.
- Allard, A. (2004), 'Speaking of Gender: Teachers' metaphorical constructs of male and female students' in: *Gender and Education*, Vol. 16 No. 3, 347- 363.
- Allard, A. and Santoro, N. (in press), 'Troubling Identities: teacher education students' constructions of class and ethnicity' in: *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol 36, No1.
- Aveling, N. (2002), 'Student-teachers' Resistance to Exploring Racism: reflections on 'doing' border pedagogy' in: *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 30, no 2, 119-130.
- Ball, A. F. (2000), 'Preparing teachers for diversity: lessons learned from the US and South Africa' in: *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol 16, No. 4, 491-509.
- Bessant, J., Hill, R. and Watts, R. (2003), *"Discovering" Risk*, New York, Peter Lang Publishing.
- Biklen, S.K. (1995), *School Work. Gender and the Cultural Construction of Teaching*, New York, Teachers College Press.
- Board of Teacher Registration, Queensland.
- Business Council of Australia (2003), *The Cost of Dropping Out: The Economic Impact of Early School Leaving* (www.bca.com.au, accessed March 2003).
- Causey, V., Thomas, C. and Armento, B. (2000), 'Cultural diversity is basically a foreign term to me: the challenges of diversity for preservice teacher education' in: *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 33-45.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995), 'Uncertain allies: understanding the boundaries of race and teaching' in: *Harvard Educational Review* 65(4), 541-569.
- Cockrell, K., Placier, P., Cockrell, D. and Middleton, J. (1999), 'Coming to terms with "diversity" and "multiculturalism in teacher education: learning about our students, changing our practice' in: *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 35-366.
- Collins, C. Kenway, J. and McLeod, J. (2000), *Factors Influencing the Educational Performance of Males and Females in School and their Initial Destinations after Leaving School*, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Canberra.
- Connell, R.W. (1993), *Schools and Social Justice*, Pluto Press, Leichardt, NSW.
- Davies, B. (1994), *Poststructuralist Theory and Classroom Practice*, Geelong, Deakin University Press.
- Davies, B. (1997), 'The Subject of Post-structuralism: a reply to Alison Jones' in: *Gender and Education*, 9(3), 271-283.

- Department of Education, Science & Training (2002) *An Ethic of Care: Effective Programmes for Beginning Teachers*. Canberra (www.dest.gov.au/schools/publications/2003/BeginningTeachers.pdf).
- Echols, C. and Stader, D. (2002), 'Education majors' attitudes about diversity' in: *Education Leadership Review*, 3(2), 1-7.
- Education Training Committee, Victorian Parliament (2005), *Final Report – Step Up, Step In, Step Out: Report on the Inquiry into suitability of pre-service teacher training in Victoria*, Melbourne, Victorian Government Printer.
- Elliot, J. (1999), 'Teacher education reforms in an age of globalization. Introduction: global and local dimensions of reforms in teacher education' in: *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 133-141.
- Erikson, E.H. (1993), *Childhood and Society*, New York, Norton.
- Fraser, N. (1997), *Justice Interruptus. Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*, New York and London, Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (1998), 'Heterosexism, Misrecognition and Capitalism: A Response to Judith Butler' in: *New Left Review*, No. 228, 140-150.
- Giddens A. (1998), *The Third Way: the renewal of social democracy*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Hollway, W. (1984), 'Gender difference and the production of subjectivity' in: Henriques, Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C. and Walkerdine, V. (eds), *Changing the Subject*, London, Methuen.
- Hooks, B. (2000), *Where we stand: class matters*, New York, Routledge.
- Jones, A. (1997), 'Teaching Post-structuralist Feminist Theory in Education: student resistances' in: *Gender and Education*, 9(3) 261-69.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001), *Crossing over to Canaan, The Journey of New Teachers in Diverse Classrooms*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Lamb, S. and McKenzie, (2000), *Patterns of Success and Failure in the Transition from School to Work in Australia* (LSAY Research Report 13, Camberwell, Australian Council for Educational Research).
- Malin, M. (1991)
- Middleton, S. (1995), 'Doing Feminist Educational Theory: a post-modernist perspective' in: *Gender and Education*, 7(1): 87-100.
- Middleton, S. (1998), *Disciplining Sexuality. Foucault, Life Histories, and Education*, New York and London, Teachers College Press.
- Olmedo, I. (1997), 'Challenging old assumptions: preparing teachers for inner city schools' in: *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 245-258.
- Piaget, J. (1971), *Biology and Knowledge: an essay on the relations between organic regulations and cognitive processes* (translated by B. Walsh), Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Phoenix, A. and Tizard, R. (1996), 'Thinking through class: the place of social class in the lives of young Londoners' in: *Feminism & Psychology*, 6(3), 427-442.
- Rizvi, F. (1992), 'Racism, multiculturalism and the cultural politics of teaching' in: Logan, L. and Dempster, N. (eds), *Teachers in Australian Schools: Issues for the 1990s*, Canberra, Australian Council of Education.
- Rizvi, F. (1993), 'Children and the Grammar of Popular Racism' in: McCarthy, C. and Crichlow, W. (eds), *Race Identity and Representation in Education*, New York and London, Routledge.
- Rose, N. (1996), 'Assembling ourselves' in: *Inventing our selves. Psychology, power, and personhood*, Cambridge University Press.
- Santoro, N. and Allard, A. (in press), 'Creating Spaces for Pedagogy: Research as Learning' in: *Australian Educational Researcher*.
- Santoro, N. and Allard, A. (2005), '(Re)Examining Identities: Working with Diversity in the Pre-service Teaching Experience' in: *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol 21, 83-873.
- Santoro N., Reid, J. and Kamler, B. (2001), 'Making difference count: A study of overseas born teachers' in: *Australian Journal of Education*, 45(1), 62-75.
- Teese, R. and Polesel, J. (2003), *Undemocratic Schooling. Equity and Quality in Mass Secondary Education in Australia*, Carlton, Melbourne University Press.
- Teese, R. et al. (1995), *Who Wins at School: boys and girls in Australian secondary education*, Department of Educational Policy and Management, University of Melbourne.
- Tsolidis, G. (2001), *Schooling, Diaspora and Gender*, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1386 (XIV) (1959), Declaration of the Rights of the Child.
- Weedon, C. (1987), *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Wulff, H. (1995), 'Inter-racial friendship. Consuming youth styles, ethnicity and teenage femininity in South London' in: Amit-Talai, V. and Wulff, H. (eds), *Youth cultures. A cross-cultural perspective*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Young, I. M. (1990), *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.